

1

## 2

3

4

5

6

7

$$\begin{pmatrix} ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \\ ) \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\begin{pmatrix} \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{pmatrix}$$

9

15

19

25

26

1 September 7, 2001, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel  
2 Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

3  
4 Appellant works in the CWU Apartment Program. The Apartment Program is located within the  
5 Office of Residential Services. Appellant reports to Field Operations Manager Steve Johnson.  
6 Appellant is responsible for a portion of the Apartment Program, specifically, handling rental of the  
7 apartments to students. Appellant does not have budgetary responsibility and is not responsible for  
8 maintenance, rental or damage deposit fee increases, or ensuring that students pay their rents.

9  
10 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant contends that at the time of her position review,  
11 she did not have an understanding of the allocation criteria for the Program Coordinator  
12 classification, otherwise, she would have provided specific information to support her reallocation.  
13 Appellant argues that she functions independently, develops and implements procedures, evaluates  
14 and interprets issues, evaluates and prioritizes activities, and evaluates and revises internal  
15 procedures. Appellant acknowledges that her supervisor retains signature authority but asserts he  
16 does not revise or change the expenditure requests or rental contracts that she forwards to him for  
17 signature. Appellant contends that while she talks with her supervisor on a daily basis, her  
18 supervisor does not oversee her day-to-day activities and he becomes involved in issues only when  
19 she feels that she needs his assistance. Appellant asserts that she works under general direction and  
20 on her own initiative exercises independent judgment, interprets rules and policies, and advises  
21 students and the public on program activities. Appellant contends that her position should be  
22 reallocated to the Program Coordinator classification.

23  
24 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent acknowledges that some of Appellant's duties  
25 and responsibilities are found in the coordinator classification but asserts that she does not  
26 perform these tasks at a level to warrant reallocation. Respondent asserts that Appellant works

1 under general supervision, performs recurring assignments without specific instructions and seeks  
2 the guidance of her supervisor for new or unusual situations and problems. Respondent contends  
3 that Appellant performs duties and responsibilities that are clerical in nature and that require  
4 knowledge and experience specific to apartment rentals for the specialized area of residential  
5 services. Respondent asserts that Appellant's duties and responsibilities are consistent with the  
6 Program Assistant classification and that her position is properly allocated.

7  
8 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position is properly  
9 allocated to the Program Assistant classification should be affirmed.

10  
11 **Relevant Classifications.** Program Assistant, class code 2255; and Program Coordinator, class  
12 code 2256.

13  
14 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
15 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
16 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
17 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
18 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
19 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
20 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
21 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

22  
23 Incumbents allocated to the Program Coordinator classification work under general direction, use  
24 knowledge and experience specific to the program, exercise independent judgment, advise staff and  
25 clients regarding the program and suggest alternative courses of action, have extensive involvement  
26

1 with staff in carrying out program activities, and monitor program activities to determine  
2 consistency with program goals.

3  
4 Employees who work under general direction carry "out work assignments in accordance with the  
5 policies and objectives the supervisor has established. The employee plans and organizes the work,  
6 determines the work methods which will be employed, and assists in determining priorities and  
7 deadlines. Completed work is reviewed in terms of the employee's effectiveness in producing  
8 expected results." (Higher Education Personnel Board Specification Development Guideline 91-04)

9  
10 Appellant does not coordinate the entire Apartment Program, is not responsible for program  
11 activities as a whole, and does not assist in determining priorities for the program. Rather, she  
12 provides support to the program by overseeing the portion of the program that rents apartments to  
13 students. Appellant functions independently and plans and organizes her own work as it relates to  
14 renting apartments, not as it relates to the overall Apartment Program. Appellant is not assigned the  
15 scope or breadth of work encompassed by the Program Coordinator classification.

16  
17 Incumbents allocated to the Program Assistant classification work under general supervision and  
18 perform specialized technical/clerical duties requiring knowledge and experience specific to and in  
19 support of the program. Incumbents provide students, staff, program participants and/or the public  
20 with information about the program, and interpret program policies, compose written  
21 communications, and establish and maintain records relating to program operations.

22  
23 Employees who work under general supervision "carry out recurring assignments without specific  
24 instruction. The supervisor provides instructions for new or unusual problems which involve  
25 deviations from normal policies, procedures and work methods. The employee's work is reviewed  
26

1 to verify compliance with policies and procedures." (Higher Education Personnel Board  
2 Specification Development Guideline 91-04)

3  
4 Appellant independently performs duties and responsibilities that are specialized to the rental  
5 portion of the Apartment Program. Because of her experience and knowledge of the CWU  
6 apartment rental procedures, Appellant is able to function without the day-to-day guidance of her  
7 supervisor, however, he is available to assist her with problems if necessary. Appellant's duties and  
8 responsibilities fit within the Program Assistant classification.

9  
10 In regard to Appellant's concern that she failed to provide adequate information during the  
11 allocation review process, we suggest that she review the provisions of WAC 251-06-060. The rule  
12 provides, in part, that:

13       Whenever an employee feels that his/her position is not allocated to the proper class,  
14       the employee or his/her representative may request a position review by the  
15       personnel officer, provided:

16       (a) The request must be in writing and describe the work assigned and performed  
17       which is alleged to be outside the class specification, and

18       (b) Six months must have elapsed since the date of the employee's last request for a  
19       review of this position as provided in this section.

20 Because six months have elapsed since the date of her last request for review, pursuant to WAC  
21 251-06-060, Appellant may initiate another position review of her position.

22  
23 **Conclusion.** Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Program Assistant classification, and  
24 her appeal should be denied. The determination of the Director, dated August 9, 2001, should be  
25 affirmed and adopted.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**ORDER**

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Ladine (Deanie) Pidgeon is denied and the determination of the Director, dated August 9, 2001, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Leana D. Lamb, Member